

Executive Summary

The FY02 *Annual Evaluation* assesses the effectiveness of Army's civilian personnel system -- from the morale, quality and representation of the work force to the effectiveness of personnelists and managers. Where possible, performance was measured against objectives. For some indicators, where objectives were not available, we compared Army performance against DOD and Government-wide data. Whenever possible, we used historical data for perspective. Key findings are reported below.

Cost/Efficiency

- Servicing ratios continued to improve. While the number of operating-level personnelists stayed the same, the number of administrative support and staff-level personnelists decreased. (pages 1-4)
- Overall civilian strength (military function) increased and was 6,150 employees above target. (page 5)
- As measured by the Civilian Productivity Reporting System (CivPro), productivity per personnelist is the highest it has been in three years and productivity per serviced employee is the highest it has been in five years. (pages 6-7)

CPA Effectiveness

- Customer satisfaction: the most recent ratings from FY01 showed dramatically improvement, up approximately 20%. (page 8)
- Timeliness of benefits processing: average processing time declined. For the first time in three years, we did not meet the OPM standard. (page 9)
- Timeliness of filling jobs: average fill-time stayed about the same, increasing from 57 to 58 days. Three years ago, average fill-time was 73 days. (page 10)
- Regulatory and procedural compliance: Army met the management-employee relations objective, but not the staffing objective. (page 11-12)
- Data quality: Army met the objectives for two of the three measures. The measure that failed missed meeting the objective by two percentage points. (pages 13-15)
- CPAC workforce effectiveness: CPACs met the amber standard for the average time a recruit/fill action flows through the CPAC. They also met the green standard for the CPAC Supervisory Assessment customer service measure. (page 16)

Management Effectiveness

- Grade and assignment accuracy: grade accuracy improved and is above the 90% objective for the third year in a row. Assignment accuracy, however, is lower than the 90% objective for the third year in a row. (pages 17-18)

- Regulatory and procedural compliance of TAPES: management continues to badly lag in this area, missing the objective by a wide margin for the third year in a row. (page 19)
- Labor-management relations: Army continues to do well in avoiding Unfair Labor Practice complaints. As for arbitration decisions, half favored management; a third were either split/mitigated, and the rest favored the union. (pages 20-21)
- Classification appeals: although the number of appeals rose in FY02, they are still in line with the long-term declining trend. However, Army did not meet the objective due to the high relatively high number (10) of appeals overturned. (page 22)
- Controlling Federal Employees Compensation Act claims and costs: FY02 DOL chargeback costs increased by nearly 6 million over FY01. The rate of long-term injury claims stayed the same in FY02. (pages 23-24)
- Estimating ACTEDS intern needs and executing allocated resources: Army executed 98% of its allocated ACTEDS intern dollars and 100% of its distributed workyears. (page 25)
- Identifying emergency essential employees: Army met the 90% objective for the third year in a row. (page 26)

Work Force Morale

- Morale: The most recent (FY01) attitude survey shows that morale improved across all dimensions, and in some areas dramatically. Supervisors have higher morale than do employees. Both groups are satisfied with their jobs, careers, co-workers, training and development opportunities, supervisors, and management. Career satisfaction is lower than job satisfaction. Both groups are relatively dissatisfied with awards and recognition, and promotion systems. We will conduct another Army-wide attitude assessment in FY03. (pages 27-37, 40)
- Formal grievances: The number of formal grievances continues to be at multi-year lows. (pages 38-39)
- Percent DA final findings of discrimination: The percentage rose in FY02 by about one-half percent over FY01 and crossed the 5 percent level for the first time in 10 years. The rise over the past two years may be due to the fact that in FY01 administrative judges were given the authority to render rather than recommend decisions. (page 41)

Work Force Quality

- The education level of civilian Army professional, technical, administrative, and clerical employees has been reasonably constant since FY92. Army's education level was similar to that of DOD but was lower than that of the Federal Government. Army's education level for professional series was nearly identical to that of DOD and that of the Federal Government. The education level of centrally funded interns in FY02 was higher than local interns or functional trainees. In FY02, the percentage for centrally funded interns with bachelor's degrees rose from 72% to 85%. (pages 42-45)

- The rate of incentive awards has nearly doubled in ten years. Army's incentive award rate was higher than the Federal Government rate and the DOD rate in FY02. (page 46)
- Army's rate of disciplinary and adverse actions is historically lower than the rates in DOD and the Federal Government (page 46). Within Army the rate of disciplinary and adverse actions is lower for minority than for non-minority employees. (page 47)

Work Force Representation

- Army's percentage of minority employees was approximately the same as last year's. The percentage has increased slightly since FY92. It was approximately the same as the DOD percentage but lower than that of the Federal Government. (pages 48-50)
- Army's percentage of female employees was the same as last year's. The percentage has decreased since FY92. It was about the same as the DOD percentage and about six percentage points lower than that of the Federal Government. (page 51)
- Army's percentage of disabled employees was slightly higher than last year's. The percentage has slowly declined since FY92, all within one percentage point. It was lower than the DOD percentage but higher than that of the Federal Government. (page 52)
- Army's percentage of female intern new hires continued to be lower than its percentage of female functional trainee new hires; however, the difference was not as great in FY02. (page 53)
- Army's percentage of minority DA interns and functional trainee new hires was mixed in FY02. (page 54)
- Army's percentage of FY02 female new hires was slightly lower than FY01. It has dropped by five percentage points since FY99. (page 55)
- Army's percentage of FY02 minority new hires increased in FY02. (page 56)